

25X1A

12 February 1976

[REDACTED]

Following information for Trends and Highlights presentation. If you have any questions, or need additional information, please give me a call on extension 4225.

25X1A

OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS MAG

Chairman - [REDACTED] (Extension 3378)

25X1A

The OC MAG group is comprised of nine members, each representing their "career panel". If you do not know your panel representative, this information may be obtained from [REDACTED] (OC representative on ADMAG).

The OC MAG group lists as a major accomplishment the revision of the reporting periods for Fitness Reports. Prior to this revision, the reporting periods began with the lowest grade and ended with the highest grade. This resulted in delays in promotions in lower grade levels since headroom would not be established until higher grade promotions had been made. The reporting periods were reversed with the higher grades first on the list, enabling promotions and headroom to be handled in an orderly manner.

Paper for
Attached to 12 Feb Minutes

It is generally agreed that a Performance Appraisal rating system is a necessary managerial tool. Virtually everyone agrees that the Performance Appraisal process is not achieving its potential as it is currently effected. This is true whether the process is considered from the standpoint of management, the supervisor or the employee.

Statistical records during the period 1 December 1971-30 November 1972 report the following letter rating percentages for this entire Agency:

O - Outstanding	8.6%
S - Strong	71.0%
P - Proficient	19.7%
M - Marginal	0.2%
U - Unsatisfactory	0.5% (2 people)

This facet of our rating system is obviously a very blunted management tool.

Causes for deficiencies and difficulties in systems of rating are - variation in use of scale from one component to another; leniency and over-rating, being a good fellow; "halo effect", carryover of one factor to affect all others; "cluster effect", bunching of ratings of all subordinates with little differentiation; lip service only, mechanical meeting of obligation; bias, favoritism, particularly toward those best known; undue weight on specific or recent incidents; confusion between performance and personality; lack of performance standards.

The ideal system has not yet been found, and many people dislike making and receiving appraisals; but no system at all would be worse. A supervisor has the obligation to give careful thought to the way his subordinates carry out their duties.

Conversly, it is most desirable that employees be able to measure themselves as they go forward through the year; since they spend more time with themselves than their supervisor does.

Therefore, fairness and full disclosure are the two keys to making a rating system work.

If we must have letter or number rating systems; then, the performance of every employee should be rated by his supervisor in one of only three categories. Any manager should be able to place each of his people easily into one of three categories, but it becomes much more difficult with five or six. The complication tends to defeat the effort to be fair.

Generally speaking, ratings fall in the classification of outstanding (see chart attached). It is anticipated that approximately 10 per cent will be at each extreme. Any supervisor whose record shows that he has no "unsatisfactory employees" may have an explanation to give his boss. Similarly one who has no "outstanding employees" over a lengthy period of time also has an explanation to give.

A Performance Appraisal should be timely, and as meaningful as possible. An objective narrative appraisal of performance will be more useful than any combination of letter or number grades. It should be focussed on actual job performance rather than personality.

The supervisor should participate with the subordinate in exploring all the factors related to performance recognizing that it is governed by the situation as well as by the person. The supervisor functions as a helper, coach, or friend, not as a judge. He stimulates thinking about ways to improve, rather than spelling out his own solutions. He assures that growth in performance can take place even without correction of personal faults. Problem solving is particularly appropriate with an ineffective employee who can reasonably be supposed to be capable of doing a job well. Practical plans and goals for improved performance and greater utilization of the individual's total abilities are developed jointly.

The supervisor and subordinate jointly discuss the subordinate's present level of performance, plot a future pathway toward eliminating barriers to development and toward achieving mutually agreed upon goals. Barriers may include aspects of the supervisor's behavior and other features of the work setting. The appraisal goes beyond assessing past performance, includes diagnosing, planning, and follow-up for change.

Performance improves most when specific measurable goals are mutually established and agreed upon by the subordinate and his supervisor. It is best that these goals be immediate or short term. Frequent reviews of progress, as the need occurs, are less threatening than the annual review.

Performance Appraisal reporting as it is described in the foregoing will most certainly achieve results satisfactory to management, the supervisor and the employee.

UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY		
Performance fails to meet requirements of the position in one or more essential aspects.	LOW—Work is barely satisfactory.	MIDDLE—Performance meets or exceeds requirements in all aspects which are essential to the successful operation of the job.	OUTSTANDING—Performance is outstanding in ALL significant aspects of the job.
Work is NOT of an "Acceptable Level of Competence."	Work IS of "Acceptable Level of Competence."		Work MAY Merit Some Form of Recognition.
An employee whose work falls in this range is not entitled to a within-grade increase.	Employee is entitled to regular within-grade increase.		QUALITY INCREASE. Employee is not only entitled to regular within-grade increase, but may be considered for an additional one for high-quality performance.

OR

SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE AWARD.
A lump sum cash award may be given where the performance falls in this range. Employee's performance in two or more aspects of his job is sufficiently beyond normal expectations so that an award is well deserved.